



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/460,944 12/14/1999 **ERAN SITNIK** PHA23.898 3145 24737 **EXAMINER** 7590 03/12/2004 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS BUI, KIEU OANH T P.O. BOX 3001 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510 2 2611

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•1						
		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/460,9	9/460,944 SITNIK, ERAN4			
		Examine	r	Art Unit		
			NH TBUI	2611		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on th	e cover sheet with	the correspondence address	S "	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no e t reply within the sta riod will apply and v tatute, cause the ap	vent, however, may a repl atutory minimum of thirty (; will expire SIX (6) MONTH plication to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this commur IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.	
Status						
1) 🂢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.					
· <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	- '					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. N	ote the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-15	52.	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Sum			
3) 🔲 Infon	ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB r No(s)/Mail Date			Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152))	

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments of Appeal Brief

1. Applicant's arguments, see the Appeal Brief, filed 12/15/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under Hwang and Levin have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hiyoshi (JP10-248020-A) and Clark (U.S. Patent 5,089,885).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiyoshi (JP10-248020-A) in view of Clark (US Patent 5,089,885).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Hiyoshi discloses a television system (Figs. 1 & 2) comprising: a connection configured to be operatively coupled to a connection of an other television (Figs. 1 & 2 as parent's television is coupled to child's television for monitoring purpose, page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007); and

a processor configured to provide information to the other television requesting information identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched on the other

Art Unit: 2611

television and configured to automatically provide information identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched at said television in response to a request from the other television, i.e., the parent can request to monitor or view the content from any child's television with the parent television control means, and the request information including the content and channel currently watched at the child's television is displaying at the parent's television display (see Figs. 1 & 2/item 16 for parent television control means, and page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007).

Hiyoshi does not further identify exactly the requests as "query information" and "providing queried information in response to a query request" from the other television; however, the technique of using "a query request" from a user to request for "query information" from another user at the other television is taught by Clark as Clark teaches a monitoring system that a host using a video television system which monitoring a plurality of television users, and based on the user query requests, the queried information can be provided to the users from the host video television system (see Clark, col. 2/lines 45-59 for monitoring concept at remote locations among slave television users, Fig. 8 for queue addressed, and Figs. 18-19, col. 17/line 3 to col. 18/line 62 for details on monitoring process and query processes between the host and the users using a computer routine for requesting and providing queried information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiyoshi's television-to-television interactive system with Clark's teaching technique in using query information as means for communicating between televisions whenever a request for that queried information initiated by one of the interactive television users.

Art Unit: 2611

As for claims 2-3 and 8, in view of claim 1 above, the combination of Hiyoshi and Clark further teaches "wherein said connection is configured to provide said query and queried information to the other television", i.e., using the link between the parent television and the child television (as illustrated in Hiyoshi, Figs. 1 & 2 using queried information as taught by Clark) and "wherein said processor is configured to receive query compliance status information identifying if said television is set up to share queried information with the other television", i.e., the status information such as the content of whether is being watching on the child television is shared with the parent television (Hiyoshi, page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007) with the query information taught as described by Clark earlier.

As for claims 4 and 9, Clark further suggests "wherein said processor is configured to receive identifying information from a user prior to enabling the user to do at least one of set and change query compliance status information", i.e., a validation process is performed before any set and change query compliance status information (Clark, Fig. 18, and col. 17/lines 3-20).

As for claims 5 and 10, the step of "wherein said processor is configured to provide any queried information to the other television that does not violate the query compliance status of the other television" is suggested by Clark as Clark suggests that the command session can be terminated if some query compliance status is not valid (Fig. 8, step 524 then to 526 if a subscriber is not a member; Figs. 9, 10, 19, 20, 22 as some examples for routines checking the validation of query requests between the host and the subscribers).

As for claims 6 and 11, Hiyoshi further discloses "wherein the connection is one of an inhome network connection", i.e., the parent monitors the child's television content within an inhome network (Figs. 1-2, and page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007), but not "an Internet connection"; however, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well-known in the art that the television system can be easily hooked up to an Internet connection using at least a modem or a cable modem or an internet interface installed within the television

Art Unit: 2611

system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to tone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiyoshi and Clark's system with a well-known modem or an internet interface in order to connect to the Internet for communicating over the Internet at a remote locations, if preferred, the communication among users not only within a home network but also within a much broader network such as over the Internet.

Regarding claims 12-14 and 16-20, these method claims and system claims with same limitations are rejected for the reasons given with respect to the system claims of 1-11 as already disclosed above.

As for claim 15, Clark further suggests "wherein said identifying is performed by a mediator that is separate from each of said plurality of televisions", i.e., a remote monitoring station acts as a mediator between a host (a service provider) and a slave system such as television users (Fig. 24, and col. 20/lines 10-58).

Conclusion

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 99. 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui Art Unit 2611 March 5, 2004

> KRISTA BUI PATENT EXAMINER